

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 15, and 20-23 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-34 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 8, 23, and 29 are independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least at page 5, lines 19-29 and page 8, line 31 – page 9, line 4 of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-24, 26 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,064,978 issued to Gardner, *et al.* (“Gardner”).

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

The Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claim 1 at least for the reasons noted on pages 10-11 in the Reply of May 2, 2011. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*:

(c) receiving evaluation data for the question from a second user or an operator of the web page, *the evaluation data of the question being an indication of the quality of the question* (emphasis added)

Gardner fails to disclose at least these features. Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite “a second user [[and]] or an operator of the web page” to make this portion of the claim consistent with the originally filed claim.

The Office Action also fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claim 8 at least for the reasons noted on page 12 in the Reply of May 2, 2011. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 8 to recite, *inter alia*:

receiving a vote for an answer from a third user during a voting period, *the vote for the answer indicating that the third user affirms the voted on answer from among one or more provided answers* (emphasis added)

Gardner fails to disclose at least these features.

The Office Action also fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claim 23 at least for the reasons noted on pages 13-14 in the Reply of May 2, 2011. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 23 to recite, *inter alia*:

receiving input for adopting the answer and evaluation data for the adopted answer from the first user, *the input and the evaluation data being received after the answer period has elapsed* (emphasis added)

As shown in steps 100, 104, Gardner teaches “receiving input for adopting the answer and evaluation data for the adopted answer from the first user” before the answer is completed in step 110 (Fig. 1). Thus, Gardner does not teach “the input and the evaluation data being received after the answer period has elapsed.”

Claim 29 recites, *inter alia*:

- (e) receiving a recommendation for the knowledge data from a third user; and
- (f) providing the recommendation on the web page in association with the knowledge data

The Office Action fails to address all features of claim 29. Specifically, the Office Action does not explain which portions of Gardner are relied upon to teach the features of “a third

user.” More importantly, Applicants respectively submit that Gardner fails to teach or suggest at least “receiving a recommendation for the knowledge data from a third user.” Therefore, Gardner fails to disclose each and every claimed feature of claim 29 for at least these reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 8, 23, and 29. Claims 2-7 and 33 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Claims 9-22 depend from claim 8 and are allowable at least for this reason. Claims 24, 26, and 28 depend from claim 23 and are allowable at least for this reason. Claims 25 and 27 depend from claim 8 or 23 and are allowable at least for this reason. Claims 30-32 depend from claim 29 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, 23, and 29, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 5, 25, 27, 28, and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Gardner in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163356 applied for by Marks, *et al.* (“Marks”).

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 8, 23, and 29 are allowable over Gardner, and Marks fails to cure the deficiencies of Gardner noted above with regard to claims 1, 8, 23, and 29. Hence, claims 2, 5, 25, 27, 28, and 31-33 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1, 8, 23, or 29.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 2, 5, 25, 27, 28, and 31-33.

Dependent Claims

Without disclaiming the independent patentability of any dependent claim, claims 9, 12, and 15 are separately patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*:

further comprising providing the polling score on the web page in association with the voted on answers

The Office Action relies upon the numerical score of Gardner to teach the polling score of claim 8 (page 4). Gardner discloses that “[a] question list 200 is displayed, with corresponding question point values 202 (the value N chosen in step 100)” (col. 3, lines 58-60). Gardner teaches providing the question points, not the numerical score, on the web page. Thus, Gardner does not teach “further comprising providing the polling score on the web page in association with the voted on answers.”

Claim 12 recites, *inter alia*:

receiving the vote comprises receiving the vote for the answer from the third user after the answer period has elapsed

The Office Action cites column 3, lines 40-45 of Gardner as teaching these features (page 5). The Office Action also states that “‘asker A determines if any more comments are needed to complete the answer’ is the voting period, col. 3, ll. 40-45” (page 4). The voting period and the answer period are each positively recited elements of the claims. Hence, column 3, lines 40-45 of Gardner cannot be relied upon to teach both the voting period and the answer period.

Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein in response to the polling score corresponding to the voted answers being less than predetermined polling score after the voting period has elapsed, not adopting an answer and displaying that there is no adopted answer

As noted above, the Office Action relies upon the numerical score of Gardner to teach the polling score of claim 8. Gardner discloses that “A assigns a quantitative evaluation, e.g. a letter grade or numerical score, to each of the comments that were deemed to constitute an

answer or part of an answer in step 106" (col. 3, lines 34-37). In Gardner, each answer or comment is given a numerical score. Gardner does not teach not adopting an answer because of a low numerical score. Thus, Gardner does not teach "wherein in response to the polling score corresponding to the voted answers being less than predetermined polling score after the voting period has elapsed, not adopting an answer and displaying that there is no adopted answer."

CONCLUSION

A full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action, and all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, all pending claims are allowable, and the application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below if it would expedite prosecution. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: July 12, 2011

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/YYK/kca